



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/659,636	09/08/2003	John Hope	HOPE-2	5211

1054 7590 11/04/2004

LEONARD TACHNER, A PROFESSIONAL LAW
CORPORATION
17961 SKY PARK CIRCLE, SUITE 38-E
IRVINE, CA 92614

EXAMINER

VU, PHUONG T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2841

DATE MAILED: 11/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/659,636

Applicant(s)

HOPE, JOHN

Examiner

Phuong T. Vu

Art Unit

2841

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the panels with the overlapping edges must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Art Unit: 2841

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 1-6, 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Applicant recited "ruggedized connectors", however, it is unclear from the specification what defines these particular connectors. It is noted in the specification that the "ruggedized connectors" are dual feature connectors which can withstand high impact and that these connectors are not commercial connectors. However, it is unclear what is meant by dual feature. Furthermore, it is unclear what forces the connector can withstand and what forces the connector cannot withstand. Applicant has noted a characteristic of the connector but does not provide details of the structure of the connector which would support these claims, especially since these connectors are not commercially available.

Furthermore claim 1 recites that the panels have overlapping edges. It is unclear from the specification and the drawings that the panels are overlapping

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1,3-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by, or in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schwenk et al. (US 5,294,748). Regarding claim 1, the reference discloses an apparatus for electromagnetically isolating a computer from the surrounding environment for preventing a transfer of electrical and magnetic field energy between the computer and the environment, the apparatus comprising, an enclosure having a plurality of metal panels (2,2',3,3',4,4',5,5') having overlapping edges fastened to one another and forming an internal chamber configured for receiving a computer, a plurality of shielding gaskets (17,17',19) positioned along said overlapping edges across all seams and gaps between said panels. The reference does not mention that the at least one of said panels having a plurality of ruggedized connectors for electrical connection of cables to external peripheral computer devices and for electrical connection with said enclosure to said computer. However, the reference teaches that the enclosure is for receiving electronic components and providing high frequency shielding for the electronic components. The panels necessarily would have connectors for allowing electrical connection of cables to external peripheral computer devices and to a power source for the electronic component to operate and function as intended. Alternatively, it would

Art Unit: 2841

have been obvious to those skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to provide electrical connectors for connection to external peripheral devices for the electronic computer to operate and function as intended. Any number of electrical connectors which may be provided may be considered to be "ruggedized" as "ruggedized" is a relative term. Most connectors may be considered to be ruggedized to at least some extent to ensure reliability of the system in which they are used.

Regarding claim 3, a plurality of brackets (1,1') are affixed in said internal chamber for securing said computer within said enclosure.

Regarding claim 4, the brackets are positioned for supporting the computer and would necessarily locate said computer at a selected distance from the ruggedized connectors.

7. Claims 2, 6, 7-9, 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schwenk et al. (US 5,294,748). Regarding claim 2, the reference does not disclose filtered cable assemblies within said enclosure for connecting said ruggedized connectors to said computer, however, although it is not mentioned, it would have been necessary to provide cables assemblies to connect to the connectors for operation of the electronic component. Furthermore, use of filtered cable assemblies is expedient in the art for providing effective electromagnetic interference shielding.

Regarding claim 6, the reference only mentions that the panels are metal. It would have been obvious to those skilled in the art at the time the invention was made that to provide metallic panels formed from heavy gauge steel for providing structural

Art Unit: 2841

support to the enclosure. Furthermore, this material is readily available, cost-effective, corrosion-resistant, and easily formed into panels.

Regarding claim 7-9, 11-12 please refer to the rejection above.

Regarding claim 13, providing in a power supply a noise or emc filter for filtering the noise component is expedient in the art.

8. Claims 2, 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schwenk et al. (US 5,294,748) in view of Mitchell et al. (US6,211,458 B1). Regarding claim 2, the reference does not disclose that at least one of said panels comprises an integral air filter for allowing air flow between said internal chamber and said environment. However, Mitchell discloses that it is known to provide air filters 10 which provide electromagnetic shielding for cooling purposes. Such a filter when installed would be integral with the panels of the enclosure. It would have been obvious to those skilled in the art at the time the invention was made that to provide an air filter as taught by Mitchell in the enclosure of Schwenk to provide cooling to the electronic components provided in the enclosure to provide air circulation and to prevent overheating of the electronic components.

Regarding claim 10, please refer to the above rejection.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phuong T. Vu whose telephone number is (571) 272-2111. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. & Tues., 7:30 AM - 4:00 PM.

Art Unit: 2841

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kammie Cuneo can be reached on (571) 272-1957. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Phuong T. Vu
Group 2841